



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,214	11/20/2003	Behnam Moradi	303.591US2	3196
21186	7590	11/24/2004	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ZIMMERMAN, GLENN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2879	

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/719,214	MORADI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Glenn Zimmerman	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 26 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-25 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0904</u> .	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.
--	--

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Amendment, filed on September 13, 2004, has been entered and acknowledged by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takemura et al. U.S. Patent 5,666,020.

Regarding claim 1, Takemura et al. disclose a field emitter display device, comprising: at least one emitter (ref. 20) comprising silicon (ref. 20b) having a coating (col. 5 lines 20-25) that releases electrons at a predetermined energy level, the coating acts in the presence of outgassing to inhibit degradation of the at least one emitter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11-15 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. U.S. Patent 5,793,154 in view of Kumar et al. U.S. Patent 5,548,185.

Regarding claim 1, Itoh teaches a field emitter display device (col. 1 lines 7-13), comprising: at least one emitter (emitter Fig. 2 ref. 18) having a coating (TiN cover layer ref. 20) that releases electrons at a predetermined energy level, the coating acts in the presence of outgassing to inhibit degradation of the at least one emitter, but fails to teach wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon. Kumar et al. in the analogous art teaches wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon (col. 2 line 60).

Additionally, Kumar teaches incorporation of such a silicon emitter to improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission (col. 2 lines 50-62).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use silicon tip in the emitter of Itoh, since such a modification would improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission as taught by Kumar et al.

Regarding claim 2, Itoh et al. discloses the field emitter display device of claim 1, wherein the coating decomposes at least one matter in the outgassing to a non-reactive state to inhibit degradation of the at least one emitter. The examiner notes that Titanium Nitride does the decomposing. This claim's decomposing of outgassing is intended use. The examiner notes that organic matter is inherently found in vacuum packaging of electronic devices from internal components.

Regarding claim 3, Itoh et al. discloses the field emitter display device of claim 2, wherein the outgassing includes organic matters. This claim's outgassing of organic matters is intended use. The examiner notes that organic matter is inherently found in vacuum packaging of electronic devices from internal components.

Regarding claim 4, Itoh et al. discloses the field emitter display device of claim 3, wherein the coating is titanium-nitride (**TiN cover layer ref. 20**).

Regarding claim 6, Itoh et al. discloses the field emitter display device of claim 3, wherein the coating is a metal nitride (**TiN cover layer ref. 20**).

Regarding claim 9, Itoh et al. discloses the field emitter display device of claim 3, wherein the coating covers the surface of the at least one emitter (**TiN cover layer Fig. 2 ref. 20; emitter Fig. 2 ref. 18**).

Regarding claim 11, Itoh teaches a field emitter display device (**col. 1 lines 7-13**), comprising: at least one emitter (**emitter Fig. 2 ref. 18**) having a coating (**TiN cover layer ref. 20**) that releases electrons at a predetermined energy level, the coating decomposes at least one matter in the presence of outgassing to inhibit degradation of the at least one emitter, wherein the outgassing includes organic matters, but fails to

teach wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon. Kumar et al. in the analogous art teaches wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon (col. 2 line 60).

Additionally, Kumar teaches incorporation of such a silicon emitter to improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission (col. 2 lines 50-62).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use silicon tip in the emitter of Itoh, since such a modification would improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission as taught by Kumar et al.

Regarding claim 12, Itoh teaches a field emitter display device, comprising: at least one emitter (**emitter Fig. 2 ref. 18**) having a coating (**TiN cover layer ref. 20**) that releases electrons at a predetermined energy level, the coating is stable in the presence of outgassing to inhibit degradation of the at least one emitter, but fails to teach wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon. Kumar et al. in the analogous art teaches wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon (col. 2 line 60). Additionally, Kumar teaches incorporation of such a silicon emitter to improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission (col. 2 lines 50-62).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use silicon tip in the emitter of Itoh, since such a modification would improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission as taught by Kumar et al.

Regarding claim 13, Itoh teaches a field emitter display device (**col. 1 lines 7-13**), comprising: at least one emitter (**emitter Fig. 2 ref. 18**) having a coating (**TiN**

cover layer ref. 20) that releases electrons at a predetermined energy level, the coating neutralizes at least one matter in the presence of outgassing to inhibit degradation of the at least one emitter, but fails to teach wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon. Kumar et al. in the analogous art teaches wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon (col. 2 line 60). Additionally, Kumar teaches incorporation of such a silicon emitter to improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission (col. 2 lines 50-62).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use silicon tip in the emitter of Itoh, since such a modification would improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission as taught by Kumar et al.

Regarding claim 14, Itoh teaches discloses a field emitter display device (**col. 1 lines 7-13**), comprising: at least one emitter (**emitter Fig. 2 ref. 18**) having a coating (**TiN cover layer ref. 20**) that releases electrons at a predetermined energy level, the coating brings about heterogeneous catalysis in the presence of outgassing to inhibit degradation of the at least one emitter, but fails to teach wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon. Kumar et al. in the analogous art teaches wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon (col. 2 line 60). Additionally, Kumar teaches incorporation of such a silicon emitter to improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission (col. 2 lines 50-62).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use silicon tip in the emitter of Itoh, since such

a modification would improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission as taught by Kumar et al.

Regarding claim 15, Itoh teaches a field emitter display device (col. 1 lines 7-13), comprising: at least one emitter (**emitter Fig. 2 ref. 18**) having a coating (TiN **cover layer ref. 20**) that releases electrons at a predetermined energy level, the coating acts in the presence of the outgassing to inhibit degradation of the at least one emitter; and a light-emitting target that radiates when the released electrons strike the light-emitting target, but fails to teach wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon. Kumar et al. in the analogous art teaches wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon (col. 2 line 60). Additionally, Kumar teaches incorporation of such a silicon emitter to improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission (col. 2 lines 50-62).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use silicon tip in the emitter of Itoh, since such a modification would improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission as taught by Kumar et al.

Regarding claim 25, Itoh teaches a field emitter display device (col. 1 lines 7-13), comprising: at least one emitter (**emitter Fig. 2 ref. 18**) having a coating (TiN **cover layer ref. 20**) that releases electrons at a predetermined energy level, the coating acts in the presence of outgassing to inhibit degradation of the at least one emitter, wherein the coating covers the surface of the emitter (**TiN cover layer Fig. 2 ref. 20; emitter Fig. 2 ref. 18**), but fails to teach wherein the at least one emitter comprising

silicon. Kumar et al. in the analogous art teaches wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon (col. 2 line 60). Additionally, Kumar teaches incorporation of such a silicon emitter to improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission (col. 2 lines 50-62).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use silicon tip in the emitter of Itoh, since such a modification would improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission as taught by Kumar et al.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. U.S. Patent 5,793,154 in view of Kumar et al. U.S. Patent 5,548,185 and Takemura U.S. Patent 5,666,020.

Regarding claim 5, Itoh et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 5, but fails to teach wherein the coating is a silicide compound. Takemura in the analogous art teaches wherein the coating is a silicide compound (**col. 5 lines 22-25; titanium silicide or platinum silicide**). Additionally, Takemura teaches incorporation of such a compound to improve the reduction in the value of the work function and the improvement of the discharge property of the electron gun (**col. 5 lines 28-30**).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a silicide compound in the coating of Itoh et al., since such a modification would improve the reduction in the value of the work function and the improvement of the discharge property of the electron gun as taught by Takemura.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. U.S. Patent 5,793,154 in view of Kumar et al. U.S. Patent 5,548,185 of Pack et al. U.S. Patent 5,921,838.

Regarding claim 7, Itoh teaches a field emitter display device (col. 1 lines 7-13), comprising at least one emitter (emitter Fig. 2 ref. 18) having a coating (TiN cover layer ref. 20) that releases electrons at a predetermined energy level, the coating decomposes at least one matter in the presence of outgassing to inhibit degradation of the at least one emitter, the outgassing including organic matters, but fails to teach wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon. Kumar et al. in the analogous art teaches wherein the at least one emitter comprising silicon (col. 2 line 60). Additionally, Kumar teaches incorporation of such a silicon emitter to improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission (col. 2 lines 50-62).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use silicon tip in the emitter of Itoh, since such a modification would improve emission of electrons and emission of electrons with a grid i.e. field emission as taught by Kumar et al.

Regarding claim 7, Itoh and Kumar teaches all the limitations of claim 7, but fail to teach a platinum coating. Park et al. in the analogous art teaches a platinum coating on a field emitter (col. 3 lines 11-14). Additionally, Park et al. teach incorporation of such a platinum coating to improve enhancement of emission (col. 3 lines 10-15).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a platinum coating in the emitter of Itoh,

since such a modification would improve enhancement of emission as taught by Park et al.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takemura U.S. Patent 5,666,020 in view of Itoh et al. U.S. Patent 5,793,154.

Regarding claim 8, Takemura teaches at least one emitter (emitter ref. 20) having a platinum silicide coating that releases electrons at a predetermined energy level (**col. 5 lines 21-25**), the platinum silicide coating decomposes at least one matter in the presence of outgassing to inhibit degradation of the at least one emitter, the outgassing including organic matters, but fails to teach a Field Emitter display. Itoh et al. in the analogous art teaches a field emitter display (**col. 1 lines 7-12;Fig. 1**). Additionally, Itoh et al. teaches incorporation of such a field element emission display to improve the usefulness of field emission elements (**col. 1 lines 9-11**).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a field emitter display in the field emission element of Takemura, since such a modification would improve the usefulness of field emitter elements as taught by Itoh et al.

The examiner notes that platinum silicide does this decomposing. This claim's decomposing of outgassing is intended use. The examiner notes that organic matter is inherently found in vacuum packaging of electronic devices from internal components.

When you have the structure, you have the function. The particular outgasses used with the emitter/coating is intended use language.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. U.S. Patent 5,793,154 in view of Kumar et al. U.S. Patent 5,548,185 and Tjaden et al. U.S. Patent 5,770, 919.

Regarding claim 16, Itoh et al. teaches all the limitations of the claim, but fails to teach wherein the light-emitting target is coated with luminescent matter. Tjaden in the analogous art teaches wherein the light-emitting target is coated with luminescent matter (**col. 2 lines 43-46**). Additionally, Tjaden et al. teaches incorporation of such a luminescent matter to improve light-emission and pixel creation (**col. 2 lines 43-50**).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a luminescent matter coating in the field emission display of Itoh et al., since such a modification would improve light-emission and pixel creation as taught by Tjaden et al.

The examiner notes that in the art of field emission displays there is no difference between luminescent matter and phosphorescent matter. Other common synonyms used for phosphorescent or luminescent matter are fluorescent material, cathodoluminescent material, fluorophor, luminophor, photoluminescent material, etc. They all mean the same thing.

Regarding claim 17, Itoh et al. teaches all the limitations of the claim, but fails to teach wherein the light-emitting target is coated with phosphorescent matter. Tjaden in the analogous art teaches wherein the light-emitting target is coated with phosphorescent matter (**col. 2 lines 43-46**). Additionally, Tjaden et al. teaches

incorporation of such a phosphorescent matter to improve light-emission and pixel creation (**col. 2 lines 43-50**).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a phosphorescent matter coating in the field emission display of Itoh et al., since such a modification would improve light-emission and pixel creation as taught by Tjaden et al.

Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hush U.S. Patent 5,663,742 in view of Takemura U.S. Patent 5,666,020.

Regarding claim 18, Hush teaches a video display (**claim 9; col. 1 lines 14-19**), comprising: a display screen (**field emission display ref. 100**) for showing a video image (**claim 9**); and an array (**field emissive array ref. 102**) of field emission devices from the video image, wherein the array of field emission devices forming the video image (**claim 9**), a light-emitting target that radiates when the released electrons strike the light-emitting target (**col. 3 lines 34-40**), but fails to teach at least one emitter having a coating that releases electrons at a predetermined energy level, the coating is stable in the presence of outgassing. Takemura in the analogous art teaches at least one emitter having a coating that releases electrons at a predetermined energy level, the coating is stable in the presence of outgassing (**col. 5 lines 22-26**). Additionally, Takemura teaches incorporation of such a coating to improve the reduction in the value of the work function and the improvement of the discharge property of the electron gun (**col. 5 lines 28-30**).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a platinum silicide coating in the field emitter of Hush since such a modification would improve the reduction in the value of the work function and the improvement of the discharge property of the electron gun as taught by Takemurà.

When you have the structure, you have the function. Also the particular outgasses used with the emitter/coating is intended use language.

Regarding claim 19, Takemura discloses wherein the coating acts to decompose at least a portion of the outgassing (**col. 5 lines 22-26**). This claim is rejected for the same reasons found in claim 18.

Regarding claim 20, Takemura discloses wherein the coating acts to neutralizes at least one matter in the outgassing (**col. 5 lines 22-26**). This claim is rejected for the same reasons found in claim 18.

Regarding claim 21, Takemura discloses wherein the coating acts to bring about heterogeneous catalysis in the presence of outgassing (**col. 5 lines 22-26**). This claim is rejected for the same reasons found in claim 18.

Regarding claim 22, Hush teaches the video display of claim 18, wherein the video display is a camcorder viewfinder (**col. 1 lines 14-15**).

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hush U.S. Patent 5,663,742 in view of Takemura U.S. Patent 5,666,020 and Haase et al. U.S. Patent 5,684,358.

Regarding claim 23, Hush and Takemura teach all the limitations of claim 23, but fails to teach wherein the video display is a flat-panel television display. Haase et al. in the analogous art teaches wherein the video display is a flat-panel television display (**col. 1 lines 9-10 and 19**). Additionally, Haase et al. teaches incorporation of such a flat-panel television display to improve the vacuum fluorescent display by increasing the number of uses for the display (**col. 1 lines 9-23 and 24-38; col. 2 lines 13-22**).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use flat-panel television display in the video display of Hush and Takemura, since such a modification would improve the vacuum fluorescent display by increasing the number of uses for the display as taught by Haase.

Regarding claim 24, Hush and Takemura teach all the limitations of claim 23, but fails to teach wherein the video display is a display on a personal appliance. Haase et al. in the analogous art teaches wherein the video display is a display on a personal appliance (**mobile telephone col. 1 lines 16-19**). Additionally, Haase et al. teaches incorporation of such a display on a personal appliance to improve the vacuum fluorescent display by increasing the number of uses for the display (**col. 1 lines 9-23 and 24-38; col. 2 lines 13-22**).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a display on a personal appliance in the video display of Hush and Takemura, since such a modification would improve the vacuum fluorescent display by increasing the number of uses for the display as taught by Haase.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 26 is allowed.

Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 10, the following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art of record neither shows nor suggests a field emitter display including the combination of all the limitations as set forth in claim 10, and specifically wherein the coating is embedded in the surface of the at least one emitter could not be found elsewhere in prior art.

Regarding claim 26, the following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art of record neither shows nor suggests a field emitter display including the combination of all the limitations as set forth in claim 10, and specifically wherein the coating is embedded in the surface of the at least one emitter could not be found elsewhere in prior art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9, 11-17 and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed September 13, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicants argue regarding claim 8 and 18 that "the **top** of

the emitter is coated with a third material". The applicants point to their application drawings figures 4B and 4C ...cover substantially the entire emitter 401, over a distance 425. The examiner notes in the application that Fig 2 has a coating 218 that covers the tip, and yet does not completely cover the reference 201s, and yet 201 is considered having a coating.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenn Zimmerman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2466. The examiner can normally be reached on M-W 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh D Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Glenn Zimmerman


Vip Patel
Primary Examiner
AU 2879